

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: 03-254

CASES: Tr 47760, OT

GP, CP, ZC,



******* INITIAL STUDY *******

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: August 11, 2003 Staff Member: Hsiaoching Chen

Thomas Guide: Pg 4461 B1-3, C1-3, D2-3, E3 USGS Quad: Mint Canyon, Newhall

Location: Terminus of Placerview Trail north of the SCE eastment, 1/4 mile north of Copper Hill Dr, south of Angeles National Forest boundary, east of Haskell Canyon Rd, between Edison Rd & Blue Cloud Rd

Description of Project: A subdivision application to create 493 lots: 479 single family, one elementary school (13.9 acres), 1 park (8.60 acres), 4 recreation (totalling 2.20 acres), one water tank, and 7 open space lots. Project also includes two water tanks located on one of the open space lots and a bridge crossing the Haskell Canyon Wash. The project relies on two access points: the primary access will be from Placerview Trail in existing Tract 47657 and an off-site secondary access is proposed as an extension of Ranchview Terrace within Tract 47657 and Tract 43589. Discretionary approval associated with the subdivision includes ZC, CP, PA, and OTP.

Gross Area: app. 452.81 acres

Environmental Setting: Site is located within the unincorporated Los Angeles County known as the community of Haskell Canyon of the Santa Clarita Valley. Site is located within an area containing coastal sage scrub, saltbush scrub, oak woodland, and non-native grass land and known for sensitive species such as Peirson's Morning Glory (*Calystegia peirsonii*), Loggerhead Shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), American Badger (*Taxidea taxus*), San Diego Black-tailed Jack Rabbit (*Lepus californicus bennettii*), California Gnatcatcher (*Poliophtila californica*), Cooper's Hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), and Coastal Western Whiptail (*Cnemidophorus tigris multiscutatus*). Site contains flat terrain with gentle slopes to steep ridgelines. Site is currently vacant except for one single family and one mobile trailer.

Zoning: A-2-1, A-2-2

General Plan: Non-urban

Community/Area Wide Plan: HM, N2, W (Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan)

Major projects in area:

<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Description & Status</u>
<u>98-046/Tr43589</u>	<u>90 SF on 75.53 AC (pending)</u>
<u>98-170/Tr47657</u>	<u>421 SFR, 115 MF and Commercial on 163 AC (5/16/00 approved)</u>
<u>88-044/Tr46183</u>	<u>177 SF LOTS ON 74 AC IN A2-2 (12/6/94 adopted)</u>
<u>88-596/Tr46908</u>	<u>317 SF on 205 AC (12/6/94 adopted)</u>

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

<u>Responsible Agencies</u>	<u>Special Reviewing Agencies</u>	<u>Regional Significance</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> None
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SCAG Criteria
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles Region	<input type="checkbox"/> National Parks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Lahontan Region	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Forest	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission	<input type="checkbox"/> Edwards Air Force Base	<u>County Reviewing Agencies</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Army Corps of Engineers	<input type="checkbox"/> Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mtns.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subdivision Committee
<input type="checkbox"/> _____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>City of Los Angeles DWP</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DPW: <u>Watershed, Land Dev (Drainage & Grading), Geotechnical, Design, T&L, Transportation Planning, Env Programs</u>
<u>Trustee Agencies</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Southern California Edison</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health Services: <u>Hygiene</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>DTSC</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Parks & Recreation</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Fish and Game	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>SCAG</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>FD (inc. Hazardous Mat.)</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> State Parks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>AQMD</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Library</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>US Fish and Wildlife Service</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Sheriff Dept</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> _____	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg		Less than Significant Impact/No Impact		
				Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		Potentially Significant Impact
				Potential Concern		
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Substantial grading, hillside development
	2. Flood	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Haskell Canyon
	3. Fire	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fire Zone 4
	4. Noise	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Site is currently undeveloped
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NPDES/SUSMP required
	2. Air Quality	10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project is close to regional threshold
	3. Biota	11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Oaks
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Oaks, drainage courses
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Closest trail is Bouquet Canyon Trail, grading
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project is close to regional threshold
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No existing service available
	3. Education	18	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Existing school districts over capacity
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nearest fire/sheriff station unable to respond in time
	5. Utilities	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Expansion of existing infrastructure is required
OTHER	1. General	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Oil wells within 500 feet
	3. Land Use	23	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	General Plan Amendment, Zone Change
	4. Pop./Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Increased demand for recreation facility
	Mandatory Findings	25	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biota, Traffic

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS) *

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map Designation: Non-urban hillside
2. ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
3. ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☒ Check if DMS printout generated (attached) Date of printout: 9/11/03

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

*EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☒ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant."

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Hsiaoching Chen

Date: _____

Approved by: Daryl Koutnik

Date: 15 SEPTEMBER 2003

☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

☐ Determination appealed--see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? Site is approximately 3 miles northeast of potential active fault (Earthquake Fault Zones Map Newhall Quad; Earthquake-induced landslide area (Seismic Hazard Zones Map Newhall/Mint Canyon Quads))
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?
Earthquake-induced landslide area (Seismic Hazard Zones Map Newhall/Mint Canyon Quads)
- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?
5-100 acre probable landslides (LA Co Safety Element Plate 5)
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?
Liquefaction (Seismic Hazard Zones Map Newhall/Mint Canyon Quads)
- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
Project proposes an elementary school
- f. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%?
Substantial grading
- g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- h. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Sections 308B, 309, 310 and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70.

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?
Haskell Canyon Wash
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?
Haskell Canyon Wash
- c. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
Construction on hillside area
- d. ☐ ☐ ☒ Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run off?
Construction on hillside area
- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?
Topography to be significantly altered
- f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)
- ☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- ☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design
-

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

- ☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?
Fire Zone 4 (LA County Safety Element Plate 7)
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? _____
- d. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? No public water currently available
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?

- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?

- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8

☒ Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design

☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?

Project proposes an elementary school site

- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?

Site is currently undeveloped

- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project? *During site preparation and construction, truck trips during site construction may travel through existing residential communities.*

- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?
-
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?
-
- ☐ ☐ ☐ If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations or is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
-
- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?
- NPDES permit required
-
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?
- NPDES permit required
-
- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____
-

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Industrial Waste Permit ☐ Health Code Ordinance No. 7583, Chapter 5
- ☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 ☒ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)
- ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
- ☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **water quality** problems?

- ☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)? Project contains 488 units of single family and a school, which together will be considered to exceed threshold of regional significance.
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
Project includes a school
- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure, or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?
Project includes 488 single family units and 1 school
- d. ☐ ☐ ☒ Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?
Oil wells immediately to the north
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- g. ☒ ☐ ☐ Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? ROG, NOx, CO, PM10
- h. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors: Site is located within non-attainment air quality district

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code Section 40506

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design

☒ Air Quality Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **air quality**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?
Site is relatively undisturbed
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
Site is relatively undisturbed
- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue, dashed line, located on the project site?
Haskell Canyon Wash
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g., coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian woodland, wetland, etc.)?
Coastal sage scrub, saltbush scrub, and non-native grass land, oak woodland
- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?
Oak trees
- f. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)? *Peirson's Morning Glory (Calystegia peirsonii), Loggerhead Shrike (Lanius ludovicianus), American Badger (Taxidea taxus), San Diego Black-tailed Jack Rabbit (Lepus californicus bennettii), California Gnatcatcher (Polioptila californica), Cooper's Hawk (Accipiter cooperii), Coastal Western Whiptail (Cnemidophorus tigris multiscutatus).*
- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Oak Tree Permit ☐ ERB/SEATAC Review

Biota Report is required.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **biotic resources**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological / Historical / Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) which indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?

Draiange course, oak trees, relatively undisturbed property

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?

Site has an existing single family residence and one mobile trailer

- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?

- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Phase I Archaeology Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical, or paleontological** resources?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
- c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

- d. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?
- b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?
- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features? Majority of site is undisturbed
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?
- f. ☐ ☐ ☒ Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration): Grading, land form alteration

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?
Many intersections in Santa Clarita near capacity
- b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
Extension of existing circulation system into hillsides
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
Project exceeds CMP threshold for single family residential project
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☒ Traffic Report ☒ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **traffic/access** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant? *Per application, the project will be served by the LA County Sanitation Districts No. 26 and No. 32. It is estimated that the project will generate 0.13 mgd. Although the current demand for sewer treatment with the two districts is 15.04 mgd which is under the capacity of 19.10 mgd, project will have potential significant impact on the sewer treatment capacity on a cumulative basis.*
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site? *Community sewage system for the site currently unavailable. Project will require existing sewer lines to be extended.*
- c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems at the district level? Saugus Union School District and William S Hart Union High School District are currently over capacity.
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site?
Individual schools with the above two districts are currently operating over capacity.
- c. ☐ ☐ ☒ Could the project create student transportation problems?
Students may be transferred to other schools not in the immediate vicinity
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand? Project will increase demand for library services by 3,016 volumes and 587 square feet to a total of 275,386 volumes and 53,563 square feet respectively, compared to current supply of 211,688 volumes and 23,966 square feet. Project will result in potential significant impacts on the project level as well as on a cumulative basis.
- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Site Dedication ☒ Government Code Section 65995 ☒ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site? The nearest fire station Fire Engine 111 located at 26829 Seco Canyon Rd, Saugus, CA 91350 and is approximately 4.5 miles from the southern project boundary. Project site is within the service area of the Santa Clarita Sheriff's Station, which is located approximately 7 miles from the project site at 23740 West Magic Mountain Parkway in Valencia.
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
Site is currently undeveloped.
- c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☒ Fire Mitigation Fees

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?
-
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
-
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
-
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?
County wide solid waste facilities are reaching capacity
-
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)? _____
- f. ☒ ☐ ☐ Other factors? Project's residential component is 488 single family units and is 12 units below the threshold (i.e., 500 units) established by recent water bills. However, together with the proposed elementary school, the project is qualified to perform a mandatory water assessment.
-

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code Ordinance No. 7834

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities/services**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?

- b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
Site is currently undeveloped.

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?

- d. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

To be discussed in conjunction with "Land Use," "Visual," and other factors.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors? _____

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?

- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?

- c. ☐ ☐ ☒ Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
Project proposes an elementary school

- d. ☐ ☐ ☒ Have there been previous uses which indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?
Oil wells within 500 feet north of the project site.

- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?

- h. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?

- i. ☐ ☐ ☐ Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- j. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Toxic Clean up Plan

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?
Project requires a General Plan Amendment
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?
Project requires a Zone Change
- c. Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
- ☐ ☐ ☒ Hillside Management Criteria? *Project will be developing in Hillside Mgt area*
- ☐ ☒ ☐ SEA Conformance Criteria?
- ☐ ☐ ☐ Other? _____
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project physically divide an established community?

- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Other factors? *Property is separated by land under DWP ownership and per LA County Code Section 21.08.170, a property for subdivision shall be considered as contiguous units even if it is separated by roads, streets, utility easements or drainage or railroad rights-of-way. Therefore, whether or not the property should contain two different tract map applications are to be determined by the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Department Land Division Section.*

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

- b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
Project site is undeveloped

- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?

- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?

- e. ☐ ☐ ☒ Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
Project will create new demand for recreational facilities. Project includes a 7.83- acre park.

- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

<u>Biota</u> |
| b. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

<u>Traffic, education, air quality, sewer treatment</u> |
| c. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

<u>Air quality, water quality</u> |

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

URBAN SERVICES ANALYSIS
FIRE PROTECTION ANALYSIS

PROJECT NO. 03-254
CASE NO. TR47760

9/11/2003

RESPONSE DISTANCE EVALUATION (MILES)

MAXIMUM DISTANCE CRITERIA

<u>Lot Type</u>	<u>Residential</u>	<u>Commercial</u> <u>Industrial</u>	<u>Approximate</u> <u>Distance</u>	<u>Potential</u> <u>Significant</u> <u>Impact</u>
SINGLE FAMILY	3		4.5	Yes

URBAN SERVICES ANALYSIS

PROJECT NO. 03-254

SEWER TREATMENT CAPACITY ANALYSIS

(MILLION GALLONS PER DAY)

CASE NO: TR47760

9/11/2003

SEWER AGENCY	EXISTING DEMAND	RECORDED	APPROVED	PENDING	PROJECT	TOTAL	SUPPLY	POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
S.D. NO. 26 & 32	15.04	3.01	5.19	3.22	0.13	26.59	19.10	YES

PLANNED EXPANSION

SEWER AGENCY	TOTAL CAPACITY	COMPLETION EXPECTED	POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
S.D. NO. 26 & 32			
FIRST STAGE	28.10	2002	NO
PRACTICAL SITE CAPACITY:	34.10	2010	NO

CRITERIA

DEMAND FACTORS (GAL/DAY):	SF	MF	MH	COMMERCIAL (PER ACRE)	INDUSTRIAL (PER ACRE)
S.D. NO. 26 & 32	260	195	156	1,440	2,009

URBAN SERVICES ANALYSIS

LIBRARY CAPACITY ANALYSIS

PROJECT NO 03-254
CASE NO. TR47760

9/11/2003

DEMAND

POTENTIAL

LIBRARY	POTENTIAL					POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	
	EXISTING DEMAND	RECORDED	APPROVED	PENDING	PROJECT	TOTAL	SUPPLY

VALENCIA							
VOLUMES	174,090	34,039	37,995	26,246	3,016	275,386	211,688
SPACE (SQ FT)	33,861	6,621	7,390	5,105	587	53,563	23,966

-AREA CLUSTER-*							
VOLUMES	320,598	68,901	126,506	68,882	3,016	587,903	348,467
SPACE (SQ FT)	62,356	13,401	24,605	13,398	587	114,347	67,777

* AREA CLUSTER IS THE GROUP OF LIBRARIES SERVING THE ENTIRE COMMUNITY.

CRITERIA

VOLUMES PER CAPITA:	2
SQUARE FOOT PER CAPITA:	0.389

Thursday, September 11, 2003

PROJECT NO. 03-254
CASE NO. TR47760

URBAN SERVICES ANALYSIS
SCHOOL CAPACITY ANALYSIS
9/11/2003

STUDENT EVALUATION

SCHOOL DISTRICT	ENROLLMENT	PENDING	APPROVED	RECORDED	PROJEC	TOTAL	CAPACITY	STUDENT OVERLOAD	POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
SAUGUS UNION	8,979	657	3,777	940	170	14,523	7,579	6,944	YES
WM.S. HART JR HI	5,217	602	1,406	650	49	7,924	5,174	2,750	YES
WM.S. HART SR HI	9,903	1,575	2,811	1,680	92	16,061	9,512	6,549	YES

PROJECT NO. 03-254
CASE NO. TR47760

URBAN SERVICES ANALYSIS WATER CAPACITY ANALYSIS

9/11/2003

WATER AVAILABILITY EVALUATION

(ACRE-FEET/YEAR)

DEMAND

POTENTIAL

WATER COMPANY	EXISTING DEMAND	RECORDED	APPROVED	PENDING	PROJEC	TOTAL	DRY SUPPLY	NORMAL SUPPLY	POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
SANTA CLARITA WC	24,513	1,447.03	3,776.99	1,671.03	268.40	31,676.45			
SC VALLEY WIDE	64,350	5,983.81	9,372.36	7,044.56	268.40	87,019.13	90,600	96,000	NO

SANTA CLARITA VALLEY WIDE FUTURE SUPPLY

YEAR			
2004	90,600	96,000	NO
2005	90,600	96,000	NO
2006	90,600	96,000	NO
2007	90,600	96,000	NO

CRITERIA

DEMAND FACTORS (AF/YR):	SF	MF	MH	COMMERCIAL (PER ACRE)	INDUSTRIAL (PER ACRE)
SANTA CLARITA WC	0.55	0.19	0.15	2.77	3.14

Note:

Dry Supply - Ranges from 90,600 to 147,500 acre-feet-per year.

Conjunctive-use and groundwater banking supplies are not included in table.

Normal Supply - Ranges from 96,000 to 151,900 acre-feet-per year.

Thursday, September 11, 2003